Summary of Decisions and Working Updates to Schedule

Presentation E1
WQGIT meeting
8:30 am, October 23, 2012
Carroll Valley, PA

Updated October 25, 2012

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Where do we want to be at 3:30 today? (besides on way home)

- What are the priority actions to include in the midpoint assessment related to past 2 days of discussion?
- What is the updated schedule for moving forward with these priorities within the midpoint assessment?
- What are the key data/information/decisions needed in order to meet/maintain this schedule?
- What are action items for the workgroups?
- What are action items for staff?
- What items need to be teed up for the Management Board and/or the Principals' Staff Committee (particularly if they are meeting before next WQGIT call)?
- [Likely defer to a future call] How to communicate the midpoint assessment to partners and the public?

Overarching Actions and Recap – Day 1

Actions:

- If any further comments on draft Guiding Principles, provide by November 2 so can be incorporated before 11/14 Management Board meeting

Recap

- Majority of priorities have to do with Principle 2, credibility with local partners. Some also have to do with Principle 4, Current and Emerging Issues
- A lot, but not everything, has to do with models

"Dot" Voting Results – Top Finishers

21 votes

- Improve the spatial, temporal, and categorical representation of urban, agricultural, federal, and natural land uses, including upland, floodplain and riparian forests vs. mixed open. To the extent possible, assign separate loading rates. Where local data unavailable, develop more accurate distribution of loads - Land Use, Forestry and WTWGs (also related to Ag WG input data)

20 votes:

- Revisit Watershed Model calibration, including regional factors, with goal of improving local watershed results – Modeling and WTWGs

"Dot" Voting Results – Top Finishers

9 votes:

- Modeling Baseline/Input Data and Assumptions – Ag WG

8 votes

- Develop schedule to achieve an effective balance between sufficient review time for tool revisions/review/ concurrence and sufficient time for target development and implementation planning – Modeling and WTWGs

- Improved modeling accuracy of hydrologic networks, land use characteristics, phosphorus and sediment – USWG, WTWG, also included in Ag WG model data processing (latter counted separately)

"Dot" Voting Results – Top Finishers

7 votes

- Trapping capacity behind dams, esp. Susquehanna, and greater capture of local impoundments and reservoirs – Other, USWG

5 votes

- CBP Modeling Suite Transparency, Accuracy and Confidence/Revising modeling system structure – Ag and Modeling WGs

"Dot" Voting Results

4 votes

- Model Data Processing – Ag WG

- Methods for backcasting historic land uses (present to 1980) and developing future land use scenarios that are locally credible and relevant. Consider 2025 land use for Phase III WIPs to incentivize land conservation and landuse planning – LU and Forestry WGs

- Enhance use of tidal monitoring data to assess WQS attainment – STAR

3 votes

- Establishment and Update of BMP Definitions and Efficiencies – Ag WG

- Expand monitoring of nutrient, sediment data in watershed – STAR

- Provide more explanation of water quality trends - STAR

"Dot" Voting Results – 2 votes

- What is the most effective way to develop/evaluate milestones in terms of the TMDL, 2017 and 2025 targets, yet at the same time ensure that jurisdictions are accounting for changes in land use/septic/animal numbers – Milestones WG

- Incorporate revised Airshed Model into the watershed and water quality modeling framework – Modeling WG

- Extend the Airshed, Watershed and Water Quality and Sediment Transport model simulation period – Modeling WG

- Develop Technical Memos – TOWG

- Explore evaluation of wastewater in the annual progress runs examining current versus average flows and to ensure increases due to growth are expected/acceptable– Milestones and WWT WGs

- TMDL revision – how, why, when – Other

"Dot" Voting Results – 1 vote

- Use growth projections to estimate offset demand – TOWG
- Enhance analysis of trends of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment in watershed – STAR
- Climate change – Other
- Air – who is the lead? – Other
- Constant Delivery Factors – do we still want to use them given that they make interim progress look lower in some cases? This was a decision of the WQGIT in summer 2011. – Other
- Federal land – segmentation or separate land use? – Other

"Dot" Voting Results – 0 votes

- Bay TMDL and WIP/Milestones Policy, including stability in allocations vs. model changes, and consideration that WWTPs have already upgraded – Ag WG, Other
- Ensure milestones set and evaluated in same model version – Milestones WG
- Refinements to the Water Quality and Sediment Transport Model – Modeling WG
- Engage STAC – Modeling WG
- Come up with way to account for trades – TOWG and WWTWG
- Determine effect of delivery factor changes on trading programs – TOWG
- Create 6th Guiding Principle to address funding - TOWG

"Dot" Voting Results – 0 votes

- Improve data for non-significant facilities, especially industrials – WWTWG
- Standardize methods to account for net loads from industrial facilities – WWTWG
- Evaluate how biosolids land applied and accounted for – WWTWG (would require coordination w/ Ag WG)
- Determine how to incorporate local septic data – WWTWG
- Develop methods for identifying/quantifying loads from commercial and residential onsite systems – WWTWG
- Agree on methods to account for reduced septic loads – WWTWG
- Refine estimates of forest land that are harvested - Forestry

"Dot" Voting Results – 0 votes

- Use verified BMP tracking data to help understand water quality responses – STAR

- Assessment of Chlorophyll-a in James – Other (somewhat related to Modeling WG priority)

- Filter feeders – Other

- Expectations for Phase III WIPs – Other

- How to assess 60% by 2017, including programmatic progress and timing of assessment - Other

"Dot" Voting Results – 0 votes

- How transition to new models while maintaining stability – Other (note was touched on in Ag WG policy priority)

- Communication of what's happening in real vs. model world – Other

- Determining methods to simulate and credit algal turf scrubbers in CBP models - Other

Goal for 9 am – 12:30

- Discussion of priorities
  - How did EPA vote?
- Charge to WQGIT and Workgroups for priorities (see next slide)
- Decision rules for how to handle priorities with few, no votes
  - Consider modelers' time
  - Who owns the "other" priorities
- Schedule – Phase III WIPs and Milestones

Fill in for as many priorities as possible:

1. [Name Priority]	
Lead	[Select which Workgroup, BMP Verif Panel/Subcomm, BMP panel, STAR, full GIT, another GIT, state, or certain entities (Eg, CBP Scenario Builder Team) that is the lead for implementing priority]
Supporting Partners	[List other Workgroups, STAR, full GIT, other GIT,s states, or certain entities (Eg, CBP Scenario Builder Team) that will be helping to implement this priority]
Necessary Datasets, Analyses, or Decisions	[List – eg, LIDaR data, sensitivity analysis, PSC decision. As appropriate, include who is the lead for acquiring these data or conducting analyses]
Approximate Start Date	[When Lead and Supporting Partners will start work on this priority]
Target End Date	[When results of implementing this priority will come before WQGIT (or MB or PSC, as needed) for final approval
Issues for MB or PSC?	[Tee up if any]